

In August 2018, plaintiff filed a *pro se* application to proceed *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. [DE 1]. Plaintiff alleges that he has been unlawfully denied Social Security disability benefits and was unlawfully denied assistance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) after Hurricane Matthew in 2016. [DE 1-1, p. 2]. He alleges that he has been denied disability benefits “for almost eight years now” and has been rejected by creditors and FEMA for damage to his home caused by Hurricane Matthew, and he seeks \$1 million in relief. [DE 1-1, p. 2–3].

In April 2019, Judge Swank entered the instant memorandum and recommendation (M&R), granting plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and recommending that plaintiff's claims be dismissed for a lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. [DE 4].

#### DISCUSSION

A district court is required to review *de novo* those portions of an M&R to which a party timely files specific objections or where there is plain error. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985). “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation and citation omitted).

No party has objected to the M&R and the time for doing so has passed. The Court has reviewed the M&R and is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. Accordingly, the memorandum and recommendation is ADOPTED.

#### CONCLUSION

The memorandum and recommendation of Magistrate Judge Swank is ADOPTED and plaintiff's complaint is DISMISSED. The Clerk is DIRECTED to close the case.

SO ORDERED, this 26 day of May, 2019.

  
TERRENCE W. BOYLE  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE